



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,532	08/01/2003	Enrique Saldivar	RM 0001P	2660
7590 12/13/2006			EXAMINER	
FUESS & DAVIDENAS			TURK, NEIL N	
17258 Amarillo Road			ART UNIT	
Ramona, CA 92065			PAPER NUMBER	
			1743	
DATE MAILED: 12/13/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/632,532	Applicant(s) SALDIVAR ET AL.	
	Examiner Neil Turk	Art Unit 1743	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Neil Turk.

(3) _____.

(2) William Fuess (applicant's representative).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 December 2006

Time: 4:30 PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-9

Prior art documents discussed:


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner discussed changes that could be made to elected claims 1-9 to place the claims in condition for allowance. In particular, independent claims 1, 3, and 7 required a limitation to the essential element of the adhesive on the flexible membrane to avoid slippage of clots. Examiner also pointed out the corrections to the drawings and the specification would be required..